

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claim 20,21 have been amended. Claims 20,21 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is included in this amendment.

In the Office Action, the Examiner makes a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and an alternate rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). In a discussion of the rejections, the demarcation line between which portion of the rejection applies to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and which portion applies to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection is unclear. For the purposes of this amendment, it is assumed that the portion of the discussion beginning at the second paragraph of page 2 and extending through the paragraph concluding on page 2 with the phrase "normal telephone call" is related to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection and that the remainder of page 3 is provided as additional discussion in support of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection.

The 35 U.S.C. 102(b) Rejection:

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,091,808 to Wood et al. Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference of each element of the applicants' claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. In Wood et al. a communication channel is set up between a telephone 14 and another telephone (not shown) via a telephone switch 16. The telephone switch 16 receives instructions to make the connection via an interface 24 from a web facility 22. The web facility 22 receives a connection command via the network 20. In Wood et al., the telephone switch and the web facility are located remotely from the telephone and the web browser. The arrangement is such that the telephone switch does not make a connection between the telephone 10 and the other telephone (not shown) without benefit of action by the web facility.

Claims 20 and 21 have been amended to distinguish Wood et al. The web browser 12 of Wood et al. does not include "a telephone plug-in connected with the web browser, the second telephone line and the telephone," and Wood et al. does not disclose "the telephone plug-in located near the web browser and the telephone," as recited in claim 20. Further, Wood et al. does not include "a telephone plug-in connected with the web browser, the telephone line and the telephone," or disclose "the telephone plug-in located near the web browser and the telephone," as recited in claim 21.

The 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection:

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 6,091,808 to Wood et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,764,736 to Shachar et al. The Examiner admits that Wood et al. does not use the term plug-in or describe the plug-in and appears to assert that the plug-in is inherent in Wood et al. However, if a person of ordinary skill in the art were to conclude that Wood et al. includes a plug-in, such plug-in is not "a telephone plug-in connected with the web browser, the second telephone line and the telephone," as recited in claim 20 or "a telephone plug-in connected with the web browser, the telephone line and the telephone," as recited in claim 21. Even if Shachar does disclose a plug-in as asserted by the Examiner, the Examiner has not demonstrated why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had an incentive to add a plug-in to the apparatus of Wood et al. in order to arrive at the apparatus described in the present invention. While the results achieved by the apparatus of Wood et al. and the results achieved by the apparatus of the present invention are similar, i.e., establishing a telephone connection between two telephones, the structure of the apparatus of Wood and the structure of the apparatus of the present invention are distinctly different, as recited in claims 20 and 21. Wood et al. requires a connection between the web facility and the telephone switch, the present invention does not. The present invention requires a connection between the web browser and the telephone near the web browser and Wood et al. does not.

In the Response to Arguments section, the Examiner states that "There is no question that plug-in software exists in the Wood et al. reference and that the plug-in software is contained in the information terminal."

In support of such a conclusion the Examiner refers to Newton's Telecom Dictionary. Newton states at page 555, : "Plug-ins are software components that extend the capabilities of Web browsers, such as Netscape. For example, they give you the ability to play audio samples or view video movies from within the browser. There are literally hundreds of plug-ins."

Applicants do not dispute that "plug-ins" exist. However, Newton does not provide any support for demonstrating "a telephone plug-in connected with the web browser, the second telephone line, and the telephone, the telephone plug-in located near the web browser and the telephone, wherein: where the user selects one of the retrieved and displayed telephone numbers, the web browser determines whether the selected telephone number is defined with a predetermined link syntax, and if the selected telephone number is defined with the predetermined link syntax, the telephone plug-in automatically dials the selected telephone number using a second telephone line independently of the web server, to set up a communication channel through the telephone independent of the telephone plug-in, the first telephone line and the internet," as claimed in claim 20 or "a telephone plug-in connected with the web browser, the telephone line and the telephone, the telephone plug-in located near the web browser and the telephone, wherein: where the user selects one of the retrieved and displayed telephone numbers, the information terminal automatically disconnects the web browser from the telephone line, the web server and the internet and if the web browser determines that the selected telephone number is defined with a predetermined link syntax, the telephone plug-in automatically dials the selected telephone number, to set up a communication channel through the telephone independent of the telephone plug-in," as claimed in claim 21.

It is applicants' claims as a whole which must be considered. Where the claims are considered as a whole, it is clear that the invention as now claimed in claims 20 and 21 distinguishes from Wood et al. and would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in view of Wood et al. and Shachar et al.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/20/04

By: 

John H. Stowe
Registration No. 32,863

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501